

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the subject application.

35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-23, 25-43, and 46-47 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,642,939 to Vallone et al. (hereinafter "Vallone"). Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1-23, 25-43, and 46-47 are not anticipated by Vallone.

Vallone discloses:

A multimedia schedule presentation system provides a program guide area which is a list of the programs that are currently airing, was aired, or is scheduled. The program guide area is semi-transparent and overlays on the broadcast program material that the user is currently watching. The invention displays the program guide information in two different modes: two column or three column. The two column mode displays the available channels in a rotating endless list fashion in the left hand column and the programs for the highlighted channel in the right hand column. The current time period is shown above the left column on the screen and is easily changed by the user. Below the time display is the listing of the channels available to the user. Next to each channel number is the station ID and the title of the current program that is being aired. A description of the current highlighted program is displayed above the two columns. The right hand column displays a schedule of the programs for the particular channel, beginning at the time indicated above the left column. The program name and start time are displayed. The program list in the right hand column can be shown in two intuitive forms. One lists the start time of each program next to the program name in descending order from the most recent time to the latest time. The second continues the time intervals by listing each half, quarter hour, or selectable intervals with duration of the program indicated by an indicator extending from the program start time down to the program end time. The three column mode adds a higher level column to the left of the channel column and contains the sorting methods available to the user. The second column presents the available channels that correspond to the sorting method with the second and third columns consistent with that of the two-column method. (Vallone Abstract).

Thus, the Vallone disclosure focuses on displaying program guides and program schedule information. The schedule presentation system described in Vallone does not disclose the elements of the claims in the present application.

Claim 1 of the present application, as amended, recites:

A method comprising:
 receiving a first broadcast data stream encoded using a first encoding format;
 receiving a second broadcast data stream encoded using a second encoding format;
 demultiplexing the first broadcast data stream while maintaining the first encoding format of the first broadcast data stream;
 demultiplexing the second broadcast data stream while maintaining the second encoding format of the second broadcast data stream;
 storing the first broadcast data stream on a storage device in the first encoding format;
 storing the second broadcast data stream on the storage device in the second encoding format; and
 time shifting the broadcast data stream.

The Office Action cites Fig. 1 of Vallone as well as Col. 5, lines 20-25 and Col. 8, lines 10-18 as support for receiving a broadcast data stream encoded using different encoding formats. (See Office Action, page 2). However, Applicant submits that the cited portions of Vallone fail to disclose the elements of amended claim 1. In particular, the language of amended claim 1 includes receiving, demultiplexing, and storing “a first broadcast data stream encoded using a first encoding format” and “a second broadcast data stream encoded using a second encoding format”. Applicant submits that the Vallone reference fails to disclose

this handling of two different broadcast data streams encoded using different encoding formats as recited in claim 1.

Vallone discloses the use of a single encoding format (MPEG). The use of a single encoding format described in Vallone is different from the elements of claim 1, which include two different encoding formats associated with two different broadcast data streams. Thus, Vallone fails to disclose the elements of amended claim 1.

Accordingly, for at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 is allowable over Vallone. Given that claims 2-11 depend from claim 1, Applicant respectfully submits that those claims are likewise allowable over Vallone for at least the reasons discussed above.

Claim 12 of the present application, as amended, recites:

A method comprising:
receiving a first digital data stream encoded using a first encoding format;
receiving a second digital stream encoded using a second encoding format;
separating components of the first digital data stream;
storing the components of the first digital data stream on a storage device, wherein the components are stored in the first encoding format;
receiving a command to play back the first digital data stream;
retrieving at least one of the stored components of the first digital data stream from the storage device;
decoding the retrieved component; and
rendering the components of the first digital data stream in a manner that corresponds to the received play back command.

Applicant submits that the Vallone reference does not disclose the elements of amended claim 12. In particular, the language of amended claim 12 includes

receiving “a first digital data stream encoded using a first encoding format” and “a second digital data stream encoded using a second encoding format”. As discussed above with respect to claim 1, Vallone discloses the use of a single encoding format (MPEG). Vallone fails to mention receiving two different digital data streams encoded using different encoding formats, as recited in claim 12. The use of a single encoding format described in Vallone is different from receiving two different data streams with different encoding formats. Thus, Vallone fails to disclose the elements of amended claim 12.

Further, Applicant submits that Vallone fails to disclose “storing the components of the first digital data stream on a storage device, wherein the components are stored in the first encoding format” prior to “receiving a command to play back the first digital data stream”, as recited in claim 12. Thus, the method of claim 12 stores the components of the first digital data stream and, at a later time, receives and decodes the stored components after receiving a command to play back the digital data stream. Vallone fails to disclose this method of operation. For example, Fig. 7 of Vallone and the associated discussion of Fig. 7 (Col. 7, line 66 through Col. 9, line 18) discloses a process that is different from the method of claim 12. For example, the disclosure of Fig. 7 in Vallone fails to disclose storing encoded data and waiting to decode the stored data until a playback command is received.

Accordingly, Vallone fails to disclose the elements of claim 12. Thus, for at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 12 is allowable over Vallone. Given that claims 13-23 and 25-31 depend from claim 12,

Applicant respectfully submits that those claims are likewise allowable over Vallone for at least the reasons discussed above.

Claim 32 of the present application recites:

A method comprising:
receiving a broadcast data stream;
separating components of the broadcast data stream;
storing the components of the broadcast data stream on a storage device;
retrieving the components of the broadcast data stream from the storage device;
decoding the retrieved components;
rendering the components of the broadcast data stream; and
receiving a request to pause rendering of the broadcast data stream, in response to the pause request:
halting rendering of the broadcast data stream;
continuing to store the components of the broadcast data stream on the storage device.

Applicant submits that Vallone fails to disclose "rendering the components of the broadcast data stream; and receiving a request to pause rendering of the broadcast data stream, in response to the pause request: halting rendering of the broadcast data stream; continuing to store the components of the broadcast data stream on the storage device", as recited in claim 32. The Office Action cites col. 9, lines 60-68 and col. 10, lines 1-10 of Vallone as support for these limitations. That portion of Vallone states:

To pause the pipeline, for example, an event called "pause" is sent to the first object in the pipeline. The event is relayed on to the next object and so on down the pipeline. This all happens a synchronously to the data going through the pipeline. Thus, similar to applications such as telephony, control of the flow of MPEG streams is asynchronous and separate from the streams themselves. This allows for a simple logic design that is at the same

time powerful enough to support the features described previously, including pause, rewind, fast forward and others. In addition, this structure allows fast and efficient switching between stream sources, since buffered data can be simply discarded and decoders reset using a single event, after which data from the new stream will pass down the pipeline. Such a capability is needed, for example, when switching the channel being captured by the input section, or when switching between a live signal from the input section and a stored stream.

The cited language of Vallone discusses objects in a pipeline and communicating a "pause" event through the pipeline. However, the cited language fails to disclose halting the rendering of a broadcast data stream and continuing to store the components of the broadcast data stream on the storage device. The mere mention of a "pause" event does not disclose halting the rendering of a broadcast data stream. Further, the "pause" event makes no reference to continuing to store components of the broadcast data stream.

Accordingly, Vallone fails to disclose the elements of claim 32. Thus, for at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 32 is allowable over Vallone. Given that claims 33-36 depend from claim 32, Applicant respectfully submits that those claims are likewise allowable over Vallone for at least the reasons discussed above.

Claim 37 of the present application, as amended, recites:

One or more computer-readable media having stored thereon a computer program that, when executed by one or more processors, causes the one or more processors to:

separate the components of a first broadcast data stream encoded using a first encoding format;

separate the components of a second broadcast data stream encoded using a second encoding format;

store the components of the first and second broadcast data streams on a hard disk drive;

receive a request to play back the stored components of the first broadcast data stream;
retrieve the stored components of the first broadcast data stream from the hard disk drive;
decode the components of the first broadcast data stream; and
render the components of the first broadcast data stream.

The Vallone reference fails to disclose the elements of claim 37. As discussed above with respect to claims 1 and 12, Vallone fails to disclose a system that handles both a first broadcast data stream encoded using a first encoding format and a second broadcast data stream encoded using a second encoding format.

Further, the Vallone reference fails to disclose storing the components of the broadcast data stream on a hard disk drive prior to retrieving and decoding those components, as recited in claim 37. Thus, the claimed system stores the components of the first and second broadcast data streams and, at a later time, retrieves and decodes those stored components (after receiving a request to play back the stored components). As discussed above with respect to claim 12, Vallone fails to disclose this method of operation. For example, Fig. 7 of Vallone and the associated discussion of Fig. 7 (Col. 7, line 66 through Col. 9, line 18) discloses a process that is different from the method of claim 37.

Accordingly, Vallone fails to disclose the elements of claim 37. Thus, for at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 37 is allowable over Vallone. Given that claims 38-42 depend from claim 37, Applicant respectfully submits that those claims are likewise allowable over Vallone for at least the reasons discussed above.

Claim 43 of the present application, as amended, recites:

An apparatus comprising:

a capture module configured to capture a first data stream and a second data stream, wherein the first data stream is represented by a first data format and the second data stream is represented by a second data format, and wherein the first data stream is encoded using a first encoding format and the second data stream is encoded using a second encoding format;

a data storage module configured to store the captured data streams in their encoded formats; and

a rendering module configured to decode the data streams and to render the data streams from the data stored on the data storage module.

As discussed above with respect to claim 1, the Vallone reference fails to disclose the handling of a first data stream encoded using a first encoding format and a second data stream encoded using a second encoding format, as recited in claim 43. As discussed above, Vallone discloses the use of a single encoding format (MPEG). In contrast, the elements of claim 43 recite the use of multiple different encoding formats.

Further, Vallone fails to disclose a first data stream represented by a first data format and a second data stream represented by a second data format, as recited in claim 43.

Accordingly, Vallone fails to disclose the elements of claim 43. Thus, for at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 43 is allowable over Vallone. Given that claims 46-47 depend from claim 43, Applicant respectfully submits that those claims are likewise allowable over Vallone for at least the reasons discussed above.


Applicant respectfully requests that the §102 rejections be withdrawn.

Conclusion

Claims 1-23, 25-43, and 46-47 are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and issuance of the subject application. Should any matter in this case remain unresolved, the undersigned attorney respectfully requests a telephone conference with the Examiner to resolve any such outstanding matter.

Respectfully Submitted,

Date: 6-13-05

By: 
Steven R. Sponseller
Reg. No. 39,384
(509) 324-9256